



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,887	08/03/2001	Satoko Araki	520.40415X00	9820

20457 7590 10/21/2004

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP  
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET  
SUITE 1800  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER

BATURAY, ALICIA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/920,887

Applicant(s)

ARAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Alicia Baturay

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/920,887.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10132204</u>  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-3 are pending.

#### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the first word in the title of the specification is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.
3. A substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.
4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: within "Description of the Preferred Embodiments," it is conventional to place spaces between the numbered elements of the figures and their descriptions. For example "the network element A10" becomes "the network element A 10." Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims recite "the step," but there is no prior step to which the definite article can be applied. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: the grouping of the descriptions is awkward. It is suggested that Applicant group descriptions of the first network element together, and descriptions of the second network element afterward. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray and further in view of Singh et al. (U.S. 5,758,083).
9. As to claim 1, Murray teaches a method for managing networks via managed objects on the network elements each of which is mutually connected (Murray, page 8, What is SNMP), where each of the network elements contains a system ID-address change function (Murray, page 65-66, Four Simple Operations, *Get* and *Set* operations), comprising: a step for a system administrator inputting to the first network element through a terminal the system ID of the second network element (Murray, page 341, Identifying SNMP-managed nodes), a step for the first network element to send an address inquiry PDU to a second network element, and the second network element sending back its own address to the first network element via the system ID-address change function (Murray, page 65-66, Four Simple Operations, *Get* and

*Set* operations). The management application is run by a network manager using a management node connected to the network. Murray does not teach steps for generating managed objects at each node for all other managed nodes. However, Singh does teach a step for the first network element, based on the received information, to send the second network element a PDU for generating a MO for its own element (Singh, col. 8, lines 11-15), a step for the second network element to generate within itself the MO for the first network element (Singh, col. 8, lines 57-63), a step for the second network element to send the PDU for generating a MO for its own network element to the first network element, and the step for the first network element to generate the MO for the second (Singh, col. 5, lines 29-34). It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Murray and Singh to enable efficient interaction between networked resources (Singh, col. 1, lines 40-42). *Note also that Singh teaches the use of SNMP trap in column 6, lines 53-54.*

10. As to claim 2, claim 1 is a method performing the same functions as claim 2. Therefore, paragraph 9 of this Office Action discloses all of the limitations of claim 2.

11. As to claim 3, Murray and Singh disclose a system for managing a network via managed objects on network elements which are mutually connected (Murray, page 8, What is SNMP), comprising: a terminal having a means to input a system ID and address (Murray, page 65-66, Four Simple Operations, Get and Set operations), a first network element connected to the terminal (Murray, page 4, The Simple Protocol, last paragraph), the terminal provides network management via a first network element to a second network element (Murray, page 5, Figure 1-1): a means for assembling a PDU for inquiring about the address

from the system ID or a PDU for inquiring about the system ID from the address and sending this PDU to the second network element (Murray, page 341, Identifying SNMP-managed nodes), means for receiving a PDU from the second network element for generating a managed object for the second network element (Singh, col. 8, lines 11-15) and generating the managed object (Singh, col. 8, lines 57-63), the first network element further comprising: a system ID-address change function (Murray, page 65-66, Four Simple Operations, Get and Set operations), a means for assembling a PDU for inquiring about the address from the system ID or a PDU for inquiring about the system ID from the address and sending this PDU to the second network element (Murray, page 341, Identifying SNMP-managed nodes), means for sending a PDU to the second network element for generating a managed object for the second network element (Singh, col. 8, lines 27-31), means for receiving a PDU from the second network element for generating a managed object for the second network element (Singh, col. 8, lines 11-15) and generating the managed object for the second network element (Singh, col. 8, lines 57-63), the second network element comprising: a system ID-address change function (Murray, page 65-66, Four Simple Operations, Get and Set operations), a means for sending back a PDU for inquiring about the address from the system ID or a PDU for inquiring about the system ID from the address (Murray, page 341, Identifying SNMP-managed nodes), means for sending a PDU for generating a managed object for the first network element to the first network element (Singh, col. 8, lines 27-31), means for receiving a PDU from the first network element for generating a managed object for the first network element and generating the managed object for the first network element (Singh, col. 8, lines 11-15; col. 5, lines 29-34).

Art Unit: 2155

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:15am - 4:45pm, Monday - Thursday, and 7:15 - 3:45pm every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB



**HOSAIN ALAM**

**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**